

I'm very concerned by Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary shortly before the election. For one thing, it's highly doubtful such a one-sided "documentary" can be considered anything but electioneering by a corporation and therefore illegal. For another, this action uses the public airways in such a way as to not serve the public interest. It certainly makes no difference which side of the political spectrum is being favored by such actions. If a media corporation forced its stations to air Moore's "Fahrenheit 9/11", then exactly the same objections could and should be raised.

Continuing consolidation of media is worrisome. Rather than receiving a diversity of information and opinion, the public is likely confined to those "blessed" by a single corporation, a corporation whose goals include increased control of media. Locally-owned media outlets are much more likely to provide news and information about their respective local areas. Giant media conglomerates are all too often concerned about profit and helping those who can repay the favors. Sinclair's decision seems to illustrate this problem; this Administration has no qualms about allowing larger and larger media conglomerates and Sinclair will apparently do what it can to help ensure the re-election of the Administration. If such consolidation is carried to the extreme, we will have little less than a state-owned media.

This is a prime example why we must limit consolidation of the media. These are the public airwaves and they must be allowed to truly serve the public good and not the agenda of a special few.

Thank you.